TLE

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,583	07/01/2003	Ronald P. Doyle	RSW9-2003-0069US1 (7161-9	6219

46320 7590 03/07/2007

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER	
MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2113	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,583	DOYLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 December 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an amendment filed on December 05, 2006 for the application of Doyle et al., for an "Autonomic program error detection and correction" filed July 1, 2003.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC § 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cobb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,119,377).

As per claim 1, Cobb discloses a method for autonomically diagnosing and correcting error conditions in a computing system (col. 2, lines 48-52) of interrelated components and resources (Fig. 10), the method comprising the steps:

For each one of the components, reporting error conditions in a log file (col. 4, lines 21-29) using both uniform conventions for naming dependent ones of the interrelated components and resources (col. 4, lines 26-29) and (Fig. 1, *application data table*) and also a common error reporting format (col. 5, lines 57-68 through col. 6, lines

1-8). Cobb discloses the EDDC process uses the application data table information to generate a dump of specific program storage areas, to create an entry in a software error log (col. 4, lines 26-29). He also discloses using a sequence-naming convention (col. 5, lines 67-68), which is a common error-reporting format.

Detecting error conditions (col. 3, lines 55-59) arising from individual ones (col. 3, lines 49-50) of the interrelated components (Fig. 7) and (col. 4, lines 21-29)

Responsive to detecting an error condition in a specific one of the components (col. 4, lines 44-50), parsing a log associated with said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) to determine whether said error condition arose from a fault in one of the interrelated components and resources named in said associated log (col. 4, lines 51-61)

And further parsing a log associated with said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said fault (col. 4, lines 62-68 through col. 5, lines 1-11) and (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41) and correcting said fault (col. 5, lines 12-20) and (col. 10, lines 67-68).

As per claim 2, Cobb discloses inserting analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37) said analysis-code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 9, lines 58-64), and utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error

condition (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 3, Cobb discloses activating dormant analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37) said dormant analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 9, lines 58-64), and utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 4, Cobb discloses inserting analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in both said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) and said one of the interrelated components and resources responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37), said analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data for said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 9, lines 58-64)

utilizing said reported operational data to correlate error conditions in each of said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 5, Cobb discloses inserting analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37) said analysis code having a

configuration for suspending the operation of said specific one of the components pending resolution of said error condition (col. 2, lines 67-68 through col. 3, lines 1-2).

As per claim 6, Cobb discloses correcting step comprises the steps of: determining from said further parsing step whether said fault in said one of the interrelated components and resources named in said associated log arose from an additional fault in yet another one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 6, lines 50-61) and, repeating each of the parsing and correcting steps for said yet another interrelated one the components and resources (col. 4, lines 62-68 through col. 5, lines 1-11) and (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41) and correcting said fault (col. 5, lines 12-20) and (col. 10, lines 67-68).

As per claim 7, Cobb discloses an autonomic system for diagnosing and correcting error conditions (col. 2, lines 48-52) among interrelated components and resources (Fig. 10) comprising:

A plurality of commonly formatted log files (col. 4, lines 21-29) utilizing standardized naming conventions for the interrelated components and resources (col. 4, lines 26-29) and (Fig. 1, *application data table*), each of said commonly formatted log files having an association with one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 5, lines 57-68 through col. 6, lines 1-8). Cobb discloses the EDDC process uses the application data table information to generate a dump of specific program storage areas, to create an entry in a software error log (col. 4, lines 26-29). He also discloses

using a sequence-naming convention (col. 5, lines 67-68), which is a common error-reporting format.

an autonomic system administrator (Fig. 10) coupled to each of the interrelated components and resources (col. 6, lines 36-39) and configured to parse said log files to identify both error conditions arising in associated ones of the interrelated components and resources (Fig. 10), and also dependent ones of the interrelated components and resources giving rise to the identified error conditions (col. 4, lines 62-68 through col. 5, lines 1-11) and (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 8, Cobb discloses a codebase of analysis code (Fig. 1) and, code insertion logic (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) coupled to said autonomic system administrator and programmed to insert portions of said analysis code in selected ones of the interrelated components and resources (col. 6, lines 36-39).

As per claim 9, Cobb discloses analysis code comprises byte code and wherein said code insertion logic comprises byte code insertion logic (col. 10, lines 14-20).

As per claim 10, Cobb discloses a machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program (Fig. 10) for autonomically diagnosing and correcting error conditions in a computing system (col. 2, lines 48-52) of interrelated components and resources (Fig. 10), the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the steps:

For each one of the components, reporting error conditions in a log file (col. 4, lines 21-29) using both uniform conventions for naming dependent ones of the interrelated components and resources (col. 4, lines 26-29) and (Fig. 1, *application data table*) and also a common error reporting format (col. 5, lines 57-68 through col. 6, lines 1-8). Cobb discloses the EDDC process uses the application data table information to generate a dump of specific program storage areas, to create an entry in a software error log (col. 4, lines 26-29). He also discloses using a sequence-naming convention (col. 5, lines 67-68), which is a common error-reporting format.

Detecting error conditions (col. 3, lines 55-59) arising from individual ones (col. 3, lines 49-50) of the interrelated components (Fig. 7) and (col. 4, lines 21-29)

Responsive to detecting an error condition in a specific one of the components (col. 4, lines 44-50), parsing a log associated with said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) to determine whether said error condition arose from a fault in one of the interrelated components and resources named in said associated log (col. 4, lines 51-61)

And further parsing a log associated with said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said fault (col. 4, lines 62-68 through col. 5, lines 1-11) and (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41) and correcting said fault (col. 5, lines 12-20) and (col. 10, lines 67-68).

As per claim 11, Cobb discloses inserting analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) responsive

to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37) said analysis-code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 9, lines 58-64), and utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 12, Cobb discloses activating dormant analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37) said dormant analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data associated with said error condition (col. 9, lines 58-64), and utilizing said reported operational data to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 13, Cobb discloses inserting analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in both said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) and said one of the interrelated components and resources responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37), said analysis code having a configuration for reporting operational data for said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 9, lines 58-64)

utilizing said reported operational data to correlate error conditions in each of said specific one of the components and said one of the interrelated components and resources to identify a cause for said error condition (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41).

As per claim 14, Cobb discloses inserting analysis code (col. 5, lines 32-37, *error detection code*) in said specific one of the components (col. 6, lines 36-39) responsive to detecting said error condition (col. 5, lines 32-37) said analysis code having a configuration for suspending the operation of said specific one of the components pending resolution of said error condition (col. 2, lines 67-68 through col. 3, lines 1-2).

As per claim 15, Cobb discloses correcting step comprises the steps of: determining from said further parsing step whether said fault in said one of the interrelated components and resources named in said associated log arose from an additional fault in yet another one of the interrelated components and resources (col. 6, lines 50-61) and, repeating each of the parsing and correcting steps for said yet another interrelated one the components and resources (col. 4, lines 62-68 through col. 5, lines 1-11) and (col. 10, lines 11-13, 40-41) and correcting said fault (col. 5, lines 12-20) and (col. 10, lines 67-68).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments see pages 2-3, filed December 05, 2006 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made over Cobb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,119,377). Refer to the corresponding section of the claim analysis for details.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571) 272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).